

Chapter 4 Section 4(f) Evaluation

Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation Act stipulates in part that: “The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of National, State, or local significance, or land of a historic site of National, State, or local significance (as determined by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if:

- There is no feasible or prudent alternative to using that land; and
- the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.”

4.1 Section 4(f) Resource

‘Tabers Corner’ has been determined to be potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

4.1.1 4.1.1 No Build Alternative

The “No Build” alternative would be to not build the project and perpetuate the existing safety deficiencies.

4.1.2 Alternatives Impacting Tabers Corner

The length of the curve realignment is approximately 980 m (3215 ft) for Option 1 and approximately 960 m (3150 ft) for Option 2. Both options provide a left turn lane at CR 80.

Option 1: Avoid Taylor Creek

This option diverges from existing SR 16 and sweeps to the south, then rejoins the current alignment avoiding all impact to Taylor Creek to the north. Option 1 was developed utilizing the highway design speed of 65 miles per hour (mph). A left turn lane is provided at CR 80. The length of the curve realignment is approximately 980 m (3215 ft).

Option 1 would impact a garage, and a portion of the orchard, both of which are contributing elements to the historic property.

Option 2: Impact Taylor Creek

Option 2 keeps the proposed highway alignment as close to the existing alignment as possible while still improving the safety of the curve. The curve proposed by Option 2 was designed based on a 55 mph design speed while the rest of the project was based on a 65 mph design

speed. Option 2 would require a retaining wall in Taylor Creek impacting biological resources to a much greater degree than Option 1. This design was developed as an effort to avoid impacting the Taber's corner property, which has been identified as a historic resource.

Two-way traffic control during construction may not be possible without temporarily occupying some of the Taber's Corner property.

The retaining wall would cost approximately \$417,000. This estimate does not include the additional biological mitigation costs.

Option 2 minimizes the projects impacts to the Taber's Corner property by keeping the proposed highway as close to the existing alignment as possible while still improving the safety of the curve. Option 2 would require a retaining wall in Taylor Creek, which will impact various biological resources. Two-way traffic control during construction will temporarily occupying some of the Taber's Corner property and likely requires some of the Walnut trees adjacent to the highway be removed. This has been determined to be an adverse effect.

4.1.3 Avoidance Alternatives

Shifting the alignment north to avoid any right-of-way acquisition from the Tabers' Corner property would require two new bridges over Taylor Creek at a cost of approximately \$2.2 million, this estimate does not include the additional roadway work that would be required or the cost of biological and farmland mitigation.

Shifting the alignment south to fully avoid any right of way acquisition from the Tabers' Corner property would require a substantially longer roadway that would impact agricultural lands to a much greater degree than the other alignments.

4.1.4 4.1.4 Measures to Minimize Harm to the Historic Property

Caltrans has attempted to minimize adverse effects to Tabers Corner by redesigning the proposed improvements using a 55mph design speed in the vicinity of the resource. As a result, less of the resource will be affected, but impacts cannot be avoided altogether. In order to mitigate for the adverse effect, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) will be prepared detailing the compensatory measures to be taken.

4.2 COORDINATION

The SHPO has reviewed the historic resource documentation and concurred with the information contained in the HPSR and FOE prepared for this project.

4.3 CONCLUSION

Option 2 is the only reasonable and feasible alternative given the substantial impacts to biological resources associated with Option 1 and the even greater impacts associated with Option 3.